REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-54 were pending. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-54 have been rejected. By the above amendments, Claims 1, 12, 22, 31, 41, 45 and 52-54 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-54 are currently pending.

Amendments to the Claims

Each of the independent Claims 1, 12, 22, 31, 41, 45 and 52-54 has been amended to include a routing software that detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device and the content having a data format. Support for these limitation is found throughout the specification, such as at least on page 6, lines 18-20, page 8, lines 9-22 and Figure 3. Accordingly, these amendments include no new matter.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Within the Office Action, Claim 41 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being unclear. Specifically, it is asserted that Claim 41 recites "a routing software" in both line 2 and line 8 which makes it unclear as to whether they are the same element or different element. By the above amendment, Claim 41 has been amended such that the phrase "a routing software" in line 8 now recites "the routing software." Accordingly, Claim 41 is now clear and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 5-13, 16-23, 26-30, 41, 43, 45 and 52-54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0098379 issued to Huang (hereafter "Huang") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0022453 issued to Balog et al. (hereafter "Balog"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees because neither Huang, Balog or the combination teach wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computer and to compare the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted.

Huang teaches a computer program that organizes and manages media files. The computer program includes a database management system for organizing data stored locally on

a computer, and a graphical user interface (GUI) for selectively accessing the organized data. [Huang, § 0025] This organization structure is nothing more than a relational database with pointers and indexes. [Huang, § 0032] The media files being managed are locally stored and accessed. In general, there is no transmitting of data from the local computer to secondary devices, such as an MP3 player or a video recorder. In particular, there is no transmitting of data based on the organization of the media files. The Huang application is specifically designed to organize and manage data locally stored in a database on the local computer on which the application is loaded. As such, Huang does not teach wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computer and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted. For the same reasons, Huang does not teach the routing software compares the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted. As acknowledged on page 4 of the Office Action, Huang also does not teach a controller coupled to the storage device to selectively transmit the digital information based on the type to one or more secondary devices. Accordingly, Huang does not teach the presently claimed invention.

Balog teaches a method for delivering content to a plurality of mobile devices coupled to each other and participating in a communication network. The mobile devices interoperate via a number of radio technologies such as the IEEE 802.11 wireless specification. [Balog, § 0021] The content includes a plurality of data types and is delivered from a service provider to at least one of the mobile devices depending on the characteristics of the data and the characteristics of the device. [Balog, Abstract] Balog teaches that a user with a plurality of devices is able to define a list of preferred devices and create a mapping of the type of content that each of the devices can render. [Balog, § 0031] However, Balog does not teach wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computer and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted. Instead, Balog teaches that the content routing application of the mobility server uses user profiles to route content to the correct user, at a specified time, using the most appropriate communication protocol and path to the preferred device. [Balog, § 0029] The routing application of Balog does not detect which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. Further, Balog does not teach the routing software is configured to compare the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted. Instead, only general content types are discussed in Balog. [Balog, Figure 4] Indeed, the "types" of Balog are so broad that they encompass many data formats. For example, one of the "types" taught by Balog is "Video/Media

Stream" which can be many different data formats such as mp3, wave, avi, etc. As a result, it is clear that Balog does not teach to compare a data format, but instead only teaches referencing a generalized content type that could be any of a multitude of data formats. Accordingly, Balog does not teach the presently claimed invention.

Within the Office Action, it is asserted that Balog teaches the claimed detecting of secondary devices by paragraphs [0023] and [0036] and Figures 5 and 6. Specifically, it is stated within the Office Action that "Balog teaches distributing content, such as video, audio, photos, etc, to devices 16 after determining the device's availability by establishing which devices are connected to service provider 42 at any given moment." [Office Action, page 2] However, the cited portions do not teach wherein a routing software detects one or more secondary devices, instead it merely teaches that the devices self-register with the mobility server 34. In other words, the service provider 42 which comprises the mobility server 34 does not have to try and detect any coupled devices, because the devices register with the mobility server 34 whenever they move into a connectivity area. [Balog, § 0036] A device self registering is not the same as routing software being configured to actively detect any devices coupled to a computing device. Indeed, in the system of Balog if a device fails to register it will not be discovered by the service provider, whereas the routing software of the presently claimed invention automatically detects secondary devices when they are coupled to the computing device. Thus, Balog does not teach wherein the routing software is configured to detect the secondary devices coupled to the computer and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted. Accordingly, Balog does not teach the presently claimed invention.

In contrast to the combined teachings of Huang and Balog, the computing device of the presently claimed invention performs automatic content sorting and network routing by file type. The computing device has a central processing unit and a storage device. The storage device stores digital content downloaded from the server and a routing software application. The routing software compares the file types of the digital content with set values that determine where the digital content is routed. Specifically, the routing software utilizes a routing table that defines which type of file is associated with which secondary device. The routing software automatically detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device and selectively transmits the digital content to the appropriate secondary device(s) according to the routing table. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computer and to compare the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for automatically routing digital information. The apparatus of Claim 1 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information and a routing software, wherein the routing software detects one or more secondary devices coupled to a computing device and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically sort and selectively transmit the digital information based on the type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Claims 5-11 are dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 5-11 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 12 is directed to an apparatus for automatically routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The apparatus of Claim 12 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information and a routing software, wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted; and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically determine which type of digital information is routed to which secondary device and selectively transmit the digital information based on the type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Claims 13 and 16-21 are dependent on the independent Claim 12. As discussed above, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their

combination. Accordingly, Claims 13 and 16-21 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 22 is directed towards an apparatus for automatically routing digital media content from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The apparatus of Claim 22 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital media content having a type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital media content and a routing software, wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and to compare the type with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically determine which type of media content is routed to which secondary device utilizing a routing table and selectively transmit the digital media content based on the type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Claims 23 and 26-30 are dependent on the independent Claim 22. As discussed above, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 23 and 26-30 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 41 is directed to a method for routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices based on a routing software that compares a type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted. The method of Claim 41 comprises receiving the digital information having the type, automatically sorting the digital information based on the type, automatically detecting the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and automatically transmitting the digital information based on the type to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 41 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Claim 43 is dependent upon the independent Claim 41. As discussed above, the independent Claim 41 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 43 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 45 is directed to a method for routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The method of Claim 45 comprises receiving the digital information having a type, automatically detecting the secondary devices coupled to the computing device with routing software that compares the type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted, automatically sorting the digital information based on the type and automatically transmitting the digital information to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices based on the type. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 45 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

The independent Claim 52 comprises an apparatus for automatically routing digital information comprising media content of different media types including music, video and data. The apparatus of Claim 52 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a media type, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information and a routing software, the routing software detects one or more secondary devices coupled to a computer and to compare the media type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically sort and selectively transmit the digital information based on the media type to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 52 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

The independent Claim 53 comprises a method for routing digital information based on a routing software that compares a data format with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted, the digital information comprising media content of different data formats from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The method of Claim

53 comprises receiving the digital information having the data format automatically sorting the digital information based on the data format, automatically detecting the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and automatically transmitting the digital information based on the data format to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. As further discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach wherein the routing software is configured to compare the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 53 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

The independent Claim 54 comprises an apparatus for automatically routing digital media content of different data formats from a computing device to one or more secondary devices. The apparatus of Claim 54 comprises an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital media content having a data format, a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital media content and a routing software, the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computing device and to compared the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted and a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically determine which data format of media content is routed to which secondary device utilizing a routing table, the routing table comprising a data format column and a device column and selectively transmit the digital media content based on the data format to the one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device detected by the routing software. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. As further discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach wherein the routing software is configured to compare the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 54 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination.

Within the Office Action, Claims 2, 13, 23, 31-33, 37, 40 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Balog and further in view

of U.S. Patent No. 6,253,207 to Malek (hereafter "Malek"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 2 is dependent on the independent Claim 1. Claim 13 is dependent on the independent Claim 12. Claim 23 is dependent on the independent Claim 22. As discussed above, the independent Claims 1, 12 and 22 are allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 1, 13 and 23 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. As further discussed above, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach wherein the routing software is configured to compare the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted. As acknowledged on page 16 of the Office Action, neither Huang, Balog nor their combination teach a computing device coupled to the server, the server including digital information.

Malek teaches a method and apparatus for separately transporting each monomedia stream of a composite multimedia signal across a network, such as an ATM network. Malek generally teaches the transfer of packet information from one server to another. [Malek, col. 4, lines 6-27] The packets of Malek are embedded with addresses to determine the destination. Malek does not teach any apparatus or method that routes digital information to an appropriate secondary device by file type. Malek does not teach a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. Malek also does not teach wherein the routing software compares the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted.

Accordingly, neither Huang, Balog, Malek nor their combination teaches a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device or wherein the routing software compares the data format with a set of values that determine where the digital media content is to be transmitted.

The independent Claim 31 is directed to a network of devices for automatically routing digital information. The network of Claim 31 comprises a server including digital information, a computing device coupled to the server for obtaining and automatically transmitting the digital

information based on the type, the computing device comprising routing software to compare a type with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted and one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device for receiving the digital information from the computing device, wherein the routing software detects the secondary devices coupled to the computing device. As discussed above, neither Huang, Balog, Malek nor their combination teaches a routing software that compares the type of the digital information with a set of values that determine where the digital information is to be transmitted *and* detects which secondary devices are coupled to the computing device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 31 is allowable over the teachings Huang, Balog, Malek, and their combination.

Claims 32, 33, 37 and 40 are dependent upon the independent Claim 31. As discussed above, the independent Claim 31 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, Malek, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 32, 33, 37 and 40 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 42 is dependent on the independent Claim 41. As discussed above, the independent Claim 41 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 42 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 24 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Balog and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,043,477 to Mercer et al. (hereafter "Mercer"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 3 and 4 are dependent on the independent Claim 1. Claims 14 and 15 are dependent on the independent Claim 12. Claims 24 and 25 are dependent on the independent Claim 22. As discussed above, the independent Claims 1, 12, and 22 are each allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 24, and 25 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 10, 43-45 and 47-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0167318 to Robbin et al. (hereinafter "Robbin"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 10 is dependent on the independent Claim 1. Claims 43 and 44 are dependent on the independent Claim 41. Claim 47 is dependent on the independent Claim 45. Claim 48 is dependent on the independent Claim 1. Claim 49 is dependent on the independent Claim 12. Claim 50 is dependent on the independent Claim 22. As described above, the independent

Claims 1, 12, 22, 41 and 45 are all allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 10, 43, 44, 45 and 47-50 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 34 and 51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Malek and further in view of Robbin. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 34 and 51 are dependent on the independent Claim 31. As described above, the independent Claim 31 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, Malek, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 34 and 51 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 35, 36, 38 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Malek and further in view of Mercer. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 35, 36, 38 and 39 are dependent on the independent Claim 31. As described above, the independent Claim 31 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog, Malek, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 35, 36, 38 and 39 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claim 46 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang, Balog, Robbin and further in view of Malek. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 46 is dependent on the independent Claim 45. As described above, the independent Claim 45 is allowable over the teachings of Huang, Balog and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 46 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner are encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: March 9, 2010

By: /Jonathan O. Owens/
Jonathan O. Owens
Reg. No.: 37,902
Attorneys for Applicant